IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE: SUBPOENA SERVED ON DAVID P. HOLLANDER	Civil Action No. 09-mc-177
GUIDEWIRE SOFTWARE, INC.,	
Movant	

O R D E R

NOW, this 15th day of December, 2009, upon consideration of the following motions:

(1) Accenture's Motion to Quash Guidewire's Subpoena to David P. Hollander, which motion was filed November 19, 2009; and

(2) Unopposed Motion to Substitute a Redacted Version of the Declaration of Diana Luo for the Unredacted Version, which motion was filed November 25, 2009 by movants Accenture LLP and Accenture Global Services GmbH;

it appearing that both motions are unopposed,[1]

---

[1] Pursuant to Rule 7.1(c) of the Rules of Civil Procedure of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, any party opposing a motion shall serve a brief in opposition, together with such answer or other response which may be appropriate, within fourteen days after service of the motion or accompanying brief. Pursuant to Rule 6(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, an additional three days are added to the time to respond where, as here, service is made electronically or by mail pursuant to Federal Rule 5(b)(2)(C) and (E).

Here, the motion to quash was filed electronically on November 19, 2009. The Certificate of Service attached to the motion indicates that it was also served on opposing counsel by first-class mail that same day. Therefore, any response in opposition was due on or before December 7, 2009 (fourteen days pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(c), plus three days pursuant to Federal Rule 6(d), plus an additional one day pursuant to Federal Rule 6(a)(3) because the last day to respond fell on Sunday, December 6, 2009).

As of the date of this Order, no party has responded in opposition to the motion to quash. Additionally, the motion to substitute a redacted declaration avers at paragraph 5 that "Counsel for Guidewire Software, Inc. consents to the entry of the requested Order." Therefore, I consider both motions unopposed.

IT IS ORDERED that Accenture's Motion to Quash Guidewire's Subpoena to David P. Hollander is granted as unopposed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that movant Guidewire, Inc.'s subpoena to David P. Hollander is quashed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Unopposed Motion to Substitute a Redacted Version of the Declaration of Diana Luo for the Unredacted Version is granted as unopposed.[2]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the redacted version of the Declaration of Diana Luo, redacted declaration is attached to the motion to substitute as exhibit A, is substituted for the unredacted declaration filed November 20, 2009 in conjunction with the motion to quash filed November 19, 2009.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall continue to mark this case closed for statistical purposes.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ James Knoll Gardner
James Knoll Gardner
United States District Judge

[2] Movants Accenture LLP and Accenture Global Services GmbH filed the within motion to quash electronically on November 19, 2009. On November 20, 2009, they filed a sealed, unredacted declaration of Diana Luo in support of their motion to quash. The within motion to substitute a redacted version of that declaration avers that "The Declaration of Diana Luo was redacted because it contains certain confidential information subject to a confidentiality order. The unredacted version of the Declaration of Diana Luo was filed under seal with the Court, and it was Movants' intention to file a redacted version electronically."